

**ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 3**

ABA LAW AND NATIONAL SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REPORT
June 1985

Reflections on Anniversaries, Detente, And Disinformation

By Frank R. Barnett

Editor's Note: There is a strong historical bond between the National Strategy Information Center, of which Mr. Barnett is president, and the ABA Standing Committee on Law and National Security. Frank Barnett, whose speech on April 30 to the committee's final breakfast session of the 1985 spring series is reproduced below, has been educational consultant to the committee since its inception. The two groups have conducted educational efforts in close cooperation, and as John Norton Moore, chairman of the committee, has indicated, they will continue to do so.

Mr. Barnett was introduced by William J. Casey, director of central intelligence, whose remarks are also reproduced below.

Mr. Casey. Frank Barnett is an educator, a foundation executive, a specialist in Soviet strategy, in European theater politics, and in defense innovation, an author and lecturer, and consultant on national security affairs.

Frank and I go back a long way. He was discovered on the banks of the Wabash, teaching literature at Wabash College. He had worked with the army in Berlin, and had come to know the Russians as have few Americans, either now or then. He wanted more action, and turned up in New York. At that time, some of us were trying to set up an organization called the American Friends of Russian Freedom. We wanted to help those Russians whom the Soviet regime sought to repatriate. There was good reason to believe that their fate, if repatriated, would be execution or the concentration camps of the gulag archipelago. We persuaded Frank to become the executive director of that organization, and he carried on that work nobly for several years.

Since that time, he has done a great many things. I think the most notable is the creation and the development of the National Strategy Information Center. I credit him with being an extremely effective director of that organization. I have always taken particular pride in watching the organization take shape under his direction, and in watching the many things that Frank Barnett has done to contribute to our national security. Let me cite just one example. It was Frank Barnett and his team who were responsible for the fact that there are now national security courses offered on 500 college campuses in the United States. I recall that when this program started, the ROTC was being driven off the campuses. Frank and his colleagues had the concept of enriching the curricula of the ROTC, and they developed this into formal programs of national security studies. At that time, there were probably not half a dozen professors of national security in the United States. I recall asking at a NATO meeting in 1970 how many such programs there were in Europe. Not surprisingly, the answer was that

there were only a handful. Since that time, thanks in large measure to Frank's considerable influence in Europe, a number of similar programs have been established.

Frank and I have had a few escapades together. There was a time when we were supporting Robert A. Taft for the Republican nomination in Chicago, and our opponents campaigned on the slogan that Taft couldn't win. This was, I think, the first covert action of a foundation called the Liberty Fund. We had Pierre Goodrich and a few others—I think Frank was the key person among them—who produced a full-page news memorandum which said, "Ike can't win." It was very persuasively done and we almost convinced him!

The work that Frank has done for some 20 years has made an important contribution to the development of our military defenses and to the ongoing modernization of our defense establishment. But, the enemy has learned how to get inside our defenses, how to manipulate our public opinion, how to manipulate our political process, and how to conduct a propaganda campaign using the techniques of semantics and various kinds of psychological skills. This is something we have to learn to cope with. Out at Langley we are holding a two-day seminar on this question: the manipulation of public opinion by our adversaries. This is a subject that I think Frank could well add to his repertoire.

And with that, I'll introduce Frank. It's a real pleasure to be here today.

Mr. Barnett. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very grateful to Bill Casey, not only for that generous introduction, but for serving as a founding director of NSIC, and even more for being a friend and tutor for over three decades.

While I have the chance, I want to add something: Bill, I have the absolute conviction that if General "Wild Bill" Donovan were with us today, he would be just as happy as the rest of your friends that his shoes fit you so comfortably. And I also would take this opportunity to refute the rumor that General Donovan used to call you "The Mumbling Pimpernel."

I owe other debts of gratitude to a number of men in this room. The ABA Committee on Law and National Security has been my regiment for nearly 25 years. In fact, NSIC owes its genesis to the prompting and support of former and present members of this committee—like Lewis Powell, Morry Leibman, Bill Mott, Jack Marsh, and John Norton Moore—to all of whom I pay deep tribute and thanks.

If NSIC has had some small success in implanting courses on national security policy in universities both here and in Europe, it's partly because we've tried to emulate the *modus operandi* of this committee. That "m.o.," as I see it, is to build consensus on unimpeachable research; avoid "hardening of the categories" in

CONTINUED

STAT